

### REMARKS

Applicants submit this Response in reply to the non-final Office Action dated March 27, 2007. Applicants have amended the specification and Claims 56 and 65 to 67. Applicants have not introduced any new matter by such amendments. The Office Action indicated allowability of Claims 72 to 75.

Applicants have enclosed a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement. The Commissioner is authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any amounts due.

The Office Action rejected Claims 56 to 61, 64, 66, 68 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,312,507 to Taylor et al. ("Taylor") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,572,327 to Plinke et al. ("Plinke"). Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse these rejections because one of ordinary skill in art would not have been motivated to combine Plinke with Taylor, as Plinke discloses a device for monitoring leakage in association with particle filtration devices, not an air treatment device such as that claimed in the last Response.

Regarding Claim 61, Applicants respectfully submit that Plinke does not inherently disclose an ozone sensor, as an ozone sensor is not necessary for the operation of the device illustrated by Plinke. For the same reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 68.

The Office Action objected to Claims 65 and 67 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Independent of the above traverse of the rejection of Claims 56 to 61, 64, 66, 68 and 71, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent Claims 56 and 66 to include the elements of Claims 65 and 67. Accordingly, in view of the indicated allowability of Claims 65 and 67, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 56 to 61, 64 to 68 and 71 are patentable over Taylor and Pinke and in condition for allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 62, 63, 69 and 70 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor and Pinke in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0165040 by Posadas ("Posadas"). In view of the patentability of independent Claims 56 and 66 as outlined above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 62, 63, 69 and 70 are patentable over the combination of Taylor, Pinke and Posadas.

Applicants have made an earnest endeavor to place this application in condition for allowance, and such allowance is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions related to this Response, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Renato L. Smith

Reg. No. 45,117

Customer No. 29190

Dated: June 27, 2007